

AF/2700

#23

Rise

1-9-02

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

# TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/013,645
Filing Date	01/26/1998
First Named Inventor	Thomas D. Henderson, et al.
Group Art Unit	2613
Examiner Name	Richard Lee
Attorney Docket Number	SEXTA 36769

RECEIVED

JAN 08 2002

Total Number of Pages in This Submission 6

## ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

technology Center 2600

- ☐ Fee Transmittal Form
- ☐ Fee Attached
- ☐ Amendment / Reply
- ☐ After Final
- ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- ☐ Assignment Papers (for an Application)
- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ After Allowance Communication to Group
- ☒ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☒ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Return Postcard

Remarks



24201

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

## SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	David G. Parkhurst, Registration No. 29,422 FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
Signature	
Date	10/30/2001

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date:

October 30, 2001

Typed or printed name David G. Parkhurst

Signature

Date


10/30/2001

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

ETH

 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: BOX AF, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on October 30, 2001

  
James W. Paul, Registration No. 29,967

RECEIVED  
JAN 08 2002  
Technology Center 2600

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of:	) Examiner: RICHARD LEE
	)
THOMAS D. HENDERSON, ET AL.	) Group Art Unit: 2613
	)
Serial No. 09/013,645	) Docket No.: SEXTA 36769
	)
Filed: January 26, 1998	)
	)
For: LANDSCAPE CAMERA	) Los Angeles, California
SYSTEM WITH ELECTRONIC FIELD	) Date: October 30, 2001
OF VIEW SWITCHING	)

BOX AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.193(b)(1)**

This is in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed August 30, 2001 in connection with the appeal filed in the above noted matter.

219874.1

Serial No. 09/013,645  
Attorney Docket No. SEXTA 36769

## **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

The Examiner is correct in noting that the first sentence under the Status of Amendments was in error, and should read that an amendment in reply to the Office Action of December 2, 1999 was filed March 7, 2000, canceling claims 4, 5 and 6, and amending Claim 1, and that it should have been noted that no amendments after the final rejection of March 15, 2001 were filed.

## **ARGUMENTS**

In the Examiner's Answer of August 30, 2001, the Examiner indicated agreement that the random access memory digital-to-analog converters (RAMDAC 78) of Baker et al do not operate as personal control units. However, in the Examiner's Answer of August 30, 2001, the Examiner summarily concluded that "since image transformations within Baker et al such as pans, up/downs, zooms, tilts, rotations, etc. are being processed/controlled by either human or computer input operations" such input operations are provided by "a personal control unit being attached to each of the video control modules 80, and thus providing a plurality of personal control units." In fact, Baker et al. discloses a transform processor engine 22 for user controls, as described at column 6, lines 40-49 and in Fig. 1. The transform processor engine 22 is further described at column 10, line 61 to column 11, line 6. Baker et al. does not provided for more than one transform processor engine.

The Examiner maintained that each one of the several displays shown in Figure 8 of Baker et al. would be controlled by a respective user, through the plurality of image processing subsystems 80 which the Examiner characterized as “video control modules” and that “since each user has the capabilities of manipulating the images, personal control units are obviously being provided for the video control modules 80 for such manipulations.” However, it is respectfully noted that the plurality of image processing subsystems 80 are not described in Baker et al as “video control modules.” Furthermore, the Examiner has mistakenly assumed that each of the displays of Baker et al. would be individually controlled by a different individual user, to support the conclusion that multiple personal control units would be provided for the multiple image processing subsystems.


The Examiner admitted to not understanding the Appellant’s argument that no input is shown in Baker et al. as coming from the displays; and the Examiner instead argued that each of the RAMDAC’s 78 provide a connection/input to the displays. It is respectfully submitted that the RAMDAC’s 78 are not shown as providing inputs from the multiple displays to the multiple image processing subsystems 80, and are only shown in Fig. 8 of Baker et al. as conveying inputs/connections to the displays, so that here again there is no disclosure of inputs from multiple users.

At page 10 of the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner argued that the critical issue was that Baker et al. provided input operations via a personal control unit, and that since there are a plurality of the image processing subsystems 80 (characterized by the Examiner

as video camera control modules), there would be an equal number of personal control units connected to each of the plurality of modules. The Examiner's argument ignores the lack of any motivation in Baker et al. for providing "plurality of personal control units," and the fact that Baker et al. teaches directly away from providing a "plurality of personal control units" for multiple users for independently controlling their own individual displays, since Baker et al. pertains to a visual imaging system and techniques which provide electronic manipulation of wide angle hemispheric scenes, such as the multimedia technique used at theme parks, of displaying on a screen or collection of screens that covers almost 360 degrees field of view, with abutting subimages in the multiple displays that need to be stitched together, which is completely contrary to the notion of providing multiple personal control units for simultaneous multiple users. It is therefore submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of Baker et al. as teaching a plurality of personal control units is based upon false assumptions and motivation provided solely by the disclosure of the present invention.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1-3 and 8 were therefore erroneous. Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 8.

Respectfully submitted,  
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP



James W. Paul  
Registration No. 29,967

JWP/DGP:rvw

Enc: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
Tele. No. (310) 824-5555  
Fax No.: (310) 824-9696

Customer No. 24201